

# The Classical Weekly

Published on Monday, October 1 to May 31, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday (Election Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day, New Year's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Easter Sunday, Decoration Day).

Each volume contains twenty-six or twenty-seven issues.

Owner and Publisher, The Classical Association of the Atlantic States.

Place of publication, Barnard College, New York, N. Y.

Editor, Charles Knapp (Barnard College, Columbia University).

Address, 1737 Sedgwick Avenue, New York, New York.

VOLUME XXVIII, No. 9

MONDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1934

WHOLE NO. 753

The Humanistic Value of Archaeology. The Martin Classical Lectures, Volume IV<sup>1</sup>. By Rhys Carpenter. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press (1933). Pp. v, 134. \$1.50.

This review falls into three parts: I, a statement, of the normal type, of the contents of the book, and general remarks on the book, II and III, detailed discussions of two very important questions raised by the book: II, Two Periods of Contact Between Greeks and Phoenicians, III, The Date of the Adoption, by the Greeks, of the Phoenician Alphabet.

## I

Interest in archaeology, particularly classical archaeology, has grown very rapidly in the popular mind within comparatively recent years. It is, therefore, an occasion of great importance when a distinguished Professor of Classical Archaeology and former Director of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens undertakes to elucidate the humanistic value of archaeology.

The contents of Professor Carpenter's book, *The Humanistic Value of Archaeology*, are as follows: Preface (iii); Table of Contents (v); I, The Archaeological Approach (3-34); II, Archaeology and Homer (35-74); III, Archaeology and Art (75-99); IV, The Humanistic Value of Archaeology (100-132); Notes (133-134).

In the first chapter Professor Carpenter gives a succinct account of the development of the science of archaeology. The aim of the scientific archaeologist, he declares, is not the discovery of treasure. Archaeology must not be confused with the tomb robbing which has been prevalent for centuries. The science of archaeology becomes a reality only when intellectual curiosity prompts exploration, when material evidence is thoroughly collected, and when the results are carefully investigated and their significance is interpreted (8). Winckelmann, although not an excavator, was perhaps the first archaeologist of modern times; through his work the science of archaeology received a great impetus. Schliemann has been considered the father of archaeological excavation. In reality, archaeology and archaeological excavation have a much longer history, a history which may be traced back to about 400 B. C. (4-8). Professor Carpenter calls attention, in a very apt sentence (9), to the most important characteristic of modern scientific excavation:

<sup>1</sup>A statement about the Martin Classical Lectures can be found in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 27.6. Volume 1 of these Lectures was reviewed by Dr. Jacob Hammer, in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 27.6-7. Volume 2 by Professor John W. Spaeth, Jr., in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 27.94-96. C. K.>

Primarily, the change in the technique of excavation depends on a realisation that the whole history of a site may lie hidden, not under the soil accumulated upon it, but in that very soil itself. . . .

He then illustrates the principles of archaeological investigation by giving several short, but admirable summaries of the results of the comparatively recent archaeological investigation of seven different structures (e.g. the Parthenon, and the Temple of Athena Victory on the Acropolis at Athens). He sees two stages in the archaeological approach to the study of antiquity. The first stage is scientific and depends upon exact observation and careful inference. In this stage the purpose of the scholar is to arrive at a picture as complete as possible of the material condition and appearance of the ancient world (32-33). The second stage is built upon and beyond the first stage. It is here that the humanistic interpretation of the objective results enters and provides the justification of the purely scientific investigation of material objects (33-34).

In the second chapter, Professor Carpenter has undertaken to show the boundaries of competence of the archaeologist and the philologist and to point out the nature of the contribution which archaeology can make to our understanding of the literature and the cultural life of the Greeks. These are important subjects, for they illustrate very forcefully the position which archaeology should hold in the thorough study of classical antiquity. Professor Carpenter devotes this chapter mainly to a discussion of three interrelated topics: (1) the importance of the Phoenicians in the early history of Greece, (2) the date at which the Greeks adopted the Phoenician alphabet, and (3) certain aspects of the Homeric Question.

In this chapter Professor Carpenter writes as follows (60):

No written literature earlier than 650, no inscriptions and no writing earlier than 700, no contact between Greeks and Phoenicians earlier than 750 B. C.: such is the picture which I believe to be historically and archaeologically true. . . .

I cannot agree with two of the conclusions which Professor Carpenter has set forth above. In Part II of this review I shall show that there *was* contact (in fact, twice) between Greeks and Phoenicians before 750 B.C., and in Part III I shall offer arguments to prove that the Greeks were employing the art of writing by the latter part of the ninth century, a few years before 800 B.C.

In dealing with Homer and the Homeric Question Professor Carpenter has done us the service of emphasizing some important points which have for too long

been overlooked by many scholars. Proceeding from the assumption that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* were written in the ninth century and contained a description of Greek civilization at the end of the Mycenaean Period, or slightly later, these scholars have concluded that the Greeks had enjoyed contact with the Phoenicians in the period between 1100 or 1200 and 700 B.C., if not earlier, and that the Greeks must have adopted the Phoenician alphabet at least by the ninth century, if not before. I heartily subscribe to Professor Carpenter's contention (49-50) that, before we can draw conclusions from the Homeric Poems with regard to these questions, we must determine at what period the Homeric Poems were composed and to what period the life which is described by these poems belongs. Archaeological investigation has made very important contributions to the solution of these problems, contributions which have too long been overlooked by many scholars. In 1912, Professor Frederik Poulsen brought forward weighty reasons for believing that the civilization described in the Homeric Poems was, in the main, that of the eighth and of part of the seventh century B.C.<sup>1</sup>. In 1926, Professor Georg Karo, after a reexamination of the available evidence, arrived at a similar conclusion<sup>2</sup>. But Professor Carpenter does not point out that the Homeric Poems describe, at least in part, the life of Greece at an earlier date. Professor Martin P. Nilsson, on the basis of his own investigations and of the work of other scholars, has set forth convincing reasons for believing that the Homeric Poems contain elements from widely differing ages, beginning with the Mycenaean Period and extending down into the Orientalizing period of Greek art<sup>3</sup>. The archaeological evidence would indicate that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* were composed during the eighth century, the *Iliad* during the earlier half, the *Odyssey* during the latter half of that century<sup>4</sup>. When the poems were written on papyrus we cannot say with assurance. It is not at all necessary to assume that the poems were written at the time of their composition. An examination of the heroic poetry of other races will disclose the fact that epic poems were composed and transmitted orally for several generations<sup>5</sup>. The Homeric Poems were, apparently, developed out of various more ancient lays which had been current since the Mycenaean Period. A genius, whom we may call Homer, fused these more ancient lays into the poems which we know as the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. He attributed many of the cus-

<sup>1</sup> Frederik Poulsen, *Der Orient und die Frühgriechische Kunst*, 168-183 (Leipzig, Teubner, 1912).

<sup>2</sup> See Georg Karo's article on Homer, in Max Ebert, *Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte*, 5, 356-360 (Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 1926).

<sup>3</sup> Martin P. Nilsson, *Homer and Mycenae*, 119-159 (London, Methuen, 1933. Pp. xi, 283). Two important articles, which discuss restricted phases of this problem, have been published since Professor Nilsson wrote his book. Giovanni Patroni, *Le Menzioni del Naos e la Cronologia dei Poemi Homerici*, *Athenaeum, Studii Periodici de Letteratura e Storia dell' Antichità* 11 (1933), 209-226, has called attention to the fact that seven *naos* are mentioned in the Homeric Poems, and that three, or possibly four, of these are of a primitive Greek type, two (or, possibly one) are of the Minoan type, two are of an Asiatic, non-Greek type, and none is of the classical Greek type. Miss H. L. Lorimer, *Pulvis et Umbra*, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 53 (1933), 161-180, shows that the practice of cremation, which was the characteristic method of disposal of the bodies of the dead in the Homeric Poems, arose in Greece after the close of the Mycenaean Period, and reached its zenith at the beginning of the ninth century. Cremation was still practised in the eighth century; it was, generally speaking, the characteristic mode of burial during the classical period of Greek history.

<sup>4</sup> Nilsson, 208-211 (see note 3, above).

<sup>5</sup> Nilsson, 184-205 (see note 3, above).

toms and material objects of his own age to much earlier ages, and, in general, paid scant attention to chronological considerations<sup>6</sup>. As a source of history, then, the Homeric Poems must be read with caution.

After discussing the province of archaeology and the relation of archaeology to architecture and to literature, Professor Carpenter goes on to consider the relation of archaeology to the graphic and the plastic arts (75-99). He calls attention to the work of Professor J. D. Beazley, who has, through the employment of a highly technical analysis, been able to arrange the great number of Attic red-figured vases according to painters and even to arrange the works of individual painters in chronological succession (75-76). The graphic and the plastic arts, Professor Carpenter thinks, move, in all countries, through a uniform technical evolution and along a preordained path, so that art in all countries must evolve through the same stages (78-79). There is, consequently, great necessity for archaeologists to determine the course of the evolutionary development of sculpture in some such way as Professor Beazley has traced an evolutionary development in the red-figured Attic vases. Professor Carpenter believes that the previous generation of classical archaeologists did not possess an adequate understanding of the principles of this evolutionary development, and that, even in the present generation, these principles are not generally understood (79-80). An instance of this lack of understanding he finds (80) in the case of those archaeologists who still believe that the statue of Hermes found at Olympia was an original statue from the hand of Praxiteles rather than a copy, made in Roman times, of the original Praxitelean statue. I pause to remark that many competent archaeologists do not accept Professor Carpenter's view in this matter<sup>7</sup>.

The recent advance in the study of the evolutionary development of sculpture has been occasioned largely by the study of the technique of marble cutting. This leads Professor Carpenter to a very interesting discussion of the tools and the methods of work employed by sculptors in Greek and Roman times (82-85). Then, after a discussion of the stylistic evolution of sculpture and painting from ancient down to modern times (86-98), Professor Carpenter brings this chapter to a close by pointing out (98-99) that the new archaeology of art is the reconstruction, from the fortuitous remains which have been disclosed by excavation and chance preservation, of the history of art in its evolutionary sequence.

In the final chapter, Professor Carpenter begins by calling attention to the fact that archaeology is concerned with the rehabilitation of the ancient world through the study of material remains. It is, therefore, necessary for the archaeologist to collect and classify a vast array of every kind of material object. It is, he thinks, particularly incumbent upon the archaeologist to record in minute detail every observation and discovery which he has made during the course of excava-

<sup>6</sup> Nilsson, 211 (see note 3, above).

<sup>7</sup> See the following articles in the *American Journal of Archaeology* 35 (1931): Gisela M. A. Richter, *The Hermes of Praxiteles*, 277-290; Valentin Müller, *Some Notes on the Drapery of the Hermes*, 291-295; William Bell Dinsmoor, *Architectural Note*, 296-297.

tion. The fact that to dig a site is to destroy it makes this procedure necessary, even though the archaeologist knows that only a very small part of the information this procedure leads him to record will ever be of value (101-107). But archaeology must progress beyond mere collection and classification. It must gain an understanding of the evolutionary development of sculpture, painting, and the other arts (107-110).

Professor Carpenter then sketches the development of classical sculpture from the archaic period, when the employment of linear and conventional indications obtained, to the Hellenistic period, when the artist had attained objective realism, which Professor Carpenter chooses to call the "Dead End". When the Dead End was reached, development ceased. Some artists then returned to the older technique, with the resultant manifestation of the archaizing sculpture of the period of the Roman Empire. In modern art the same trend is manifest, but certain important artists have revolted against realistic imitation and have advanced beyond the Dead End. Likewise, in classical painting artists seem to have advanced beyond the Dead End by turning away from objective realism and adopting the technique of impressionism. Further, in the Byzantine period impressionism seems to have given way to expressionism and to symbolism of a religious character. The artist of the Renaissance had to begin again the attempt to attain objective realism (110-127).

These speculations lead Professor Carpenter to make an appeal for a broader, more philosophical treatment of the scientifically classified data of the archaeologist. Otherwise, he thinks, the science of archaeology is useless. Justification of the study of archaeology is to be found in the fact that classical archaeology illuminates the traditional classical humanism. He concludes thus (131): "And so it seems to follow that the true justification for classical archaeology is precisely the same as for Greek studies in general. . . ."

In 1912 Professor Waldemar Deonna published a comprehensive work entitled *L'Archéologie: Sa Valeur, Ses Méthodes*<sup>8</sup>. Professor Carpenter has, in the book under review, not attempted to write such a complete treatise as that of Deonna. He has, however, by utilizing the advance in our knowledge since 1912, given us an excellent account of the new science of archaeology which had not yet come into existence when Professor Deonna wrote his treatise. Professor Carpenter's accounts of the relation of archaeology to architecture, to painting, to sculpture, and to literature are very stimulating, and his appeal for the humanistic interpretation of archaeology is timely. In spite of exceptions which may be taken to some of the conclusions set forth in Chapter II, Professor Carpenter is to be congratulated upon his accomplishment in writing a very suggestive book which will be of value to all students of classical archaeology.

## II

### TWO PERIODS OF CONTACT BETWEEN GREEKS AND PHOENICIANS

In Part I of my review of Professor Carpenter's book, *The Humanistic Value of Archaeology*, I stated that I

<sup>8</sup>3 volumes (Paris, Laurens, 1912).

could not agree with his conclusion that there was no contact between Greeks and Phoenicians before 750 B. C. On the contrary there were, I am convinced, two periods of contact between Greeks and Phoenicians in early times: (1) between about 1430 and about 1200 B. C. Greeks sailed to Phoenicia and carried on trade with Phoenician cities, (2) in the early part of the eighth century, shortly after 800 B. C., Phoenicians sailed into the Aegean.

In 1894 Professor Karl Julius Beloch<sup>9</sup> called attention to the fact that in the area of the Aegean no Phoenician objects had been found which could be assigned to a date earlier than 750 B. C., and, after a thorough consideration of the question, came to the conclusion that there were no Phoenician colonies or trading stations in Greece before the latter part of the eighth century B. C. He consequently believed that contact between Greeks and Phoenicians began at that time. Professor Carpenter has surveyed (41-62) the archaeological material which has been found up to the present time and has arrived at a conclusion which agrees with that of Beloch.

Let us examine this conclusion. Obviously we must be able to define Phoenician objects if we expect to trace, by means of archaeological evidence, the progress of Phoenician commercial expansion. What, then, do we know about Phoenician art? We have no knowledge of Phoenician art before 1000 B. C.<sup>10</sup> Even for the centuries following 1000 B. C. our knowledge of Phoenician art is so unsatisfactory that it has even been denied that the Phoenicians possessed an art of their own<sup>11</sup>. Professor Valentin Müller, in an excellent discussion of Phoenician art, states bluntly that there is no "ausreichendes Kriterium" for Phoenician art<sup>12</sup>. In fact the art of the Phoenicians is such an eclectic art that another distinguished authority<sup>13</sup> has said, ". . . Nous y retrouvons toujours un caractère d'emprunt et un manque de personnalité profonde. . . ." However, Professor Müller has shown that we have sufficient knowledge concerning Phoenician art to justify the assertion that strong Oriental influences were active in Greek art by 750<sup>14</sup>. He would, apparently, then, subscribe to the belief that even before 750 Greek art was being subjected to a certain extent to Oriental influence. Dr. Bernhard Schweitzer<sup>15</sup>, in an excellent study of Greek geometric art, has reached a conclusion which agrees fairly well with that of Müller. He thinks that Greek art was being subjected to substantial Oriental influence, which was transmitted through Cyprus and Rhodes, in the early

<sup>9</sup><Karl> Julius Beloch, *Die Phoeniker am Aegaeischen Meer, Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 49 (1894), 111-132. Compare also his *Griechische Geschichte*, Volume 1, Part 2, 65-76 (Leipzig, Walter de Gruyter, 1926).

<sup>10</sup>Frederik Poulsen, *Der Orient und die Frühgriechische Kunst*, 2 (Leipzig, Teubner, 1912).

<sup>11</sup>Christian Blinkenberg and K. F. Kinch, *Lindos, Fouilles de l'Acropole, 1902-1914*, 1.42 (Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 1931).

<sup>12</sup>Valentin Kurt Müller, *Frühe Plastik in Griechenland und Vorderasien*, 1.37-142, especially 137 (Augsburg, Benno Filsler, 1929).

<sup>13</sup>G<eorges> Contenau, *La Civilisation Phénicienne*, 277 (Paris, Payot, 1926).

<sup>14</sup>Valentin Kurt Müller, *Frühe Plastik . . . . 228* (see note 12, above). Compare Emil Kunze, *Kretische Bronzereliefs*, 247-266 (Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1931).

<sup>15</sup>Bernhard Schweitzer, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie und Geschichte der Geometrischen Stile in Griechenland*, II, *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung* 43 (1918), 1-152, especially 148-152.

part of the eighth century B. C. What, then, of the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries? The prevailing opinion has been that the Greeks enjoyed no intercourse with eastern peoples during this period. Very recently, however, Dr. Anna Roes has contended that Greek geometric art, which has heretofore been considered of native Greek, or of northern origin, was developed under the influence of elements which may be detected in proto-Elamitic art<sup>16</sup>. If her thesis were correct, we should have proof of eastern influence upon Greek culture as early as 900 B. C., which is usually accepted as the date of the beginning of the Greek Geometric Period<sup>17</sup>. But Dr. Roes's theory has not gained acceptance<sup>18</sup>. In fact, recent investigation has brought forward fairly conclusive proof that the rude Greek sculpture of the ninth century was entirely a native product<sup>19</sup>. There is no need to inquire into the possibility of the presence of Phoenicians in the Aegean area in the tenth and the eleventh centuries, for we possess practically no knowledge of conditions in Greece during those centuries. But what of the very persistent tradition of Phoenician influence upon Greek culture and of the presence of Phoenicians in Greece as early as the thirteenth century or the fourteenth century? This tradition was current among the Greeks of the classical period. In modern times it has been rather generally taken at face value. But the many supposed instances of Phoenician influence upon Greek culture have, upon examination, proved to be fictitious<sup>20</sup>. Besides, as we saw above, there is not even proof of the *presence* of Phoenicians in Greece before the eighth century B. C. Further, what of the very persistent tradition concerning the importance of the Phoenician merchant fleet and its contact with the Greeks? In our sources we find Phoenician ships mentioned first in the so-called El-Amarna correspondence of the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth century<sup>21</sup>. But the expansion of Phoenician mercantile activities did not take place at that time. The merchant fleet of the Mycenaeans was predominant in the Aegean and in the eastern part of the Mediterranean until about 1200 B. C.; it is probable that Phoenician trade was not widely developed until after that time<sup>22</sup>. Furthermore,

it was not until about 1200 that the Phoenicians obtained their freedom from Egyptian domination and were in a position to undertake a program of commercial expansion<sup>23</sup>. But the twelfth century, with its wars and its migrations, would not have been a favorable period for the expansion of mercantile activities. Consequently, it was probably in the eleventh century that the Phoenicians undertook widespread commercial activities<sup>24</sup>. However, there is no evidence to show that the Phoenicians sailed into the Aegean area for purposes of trade at such an early date. In the light of these facts, I am inclined to accept Professor Eduard Meyer's explanation that the tradition of the importance of the Phoenicians in Greek life of early times is to be attributed to the fictions of the early genealogical poets<sup>25</sup>. When, then, did the Phoenicians begin to trade with the Greeks in the Aegean area? The possibility of the *presence* of the Phoenicians in the Aegean before the eighth century we cannot absolutely deny on the ground that no Phoenician objects of a date earlier than the eighth century have been found in Greek lands, for that is a negative argument which may be overthrown by future discoveries. We can, however, say that the evidence now at our disposal justifies us in assuming that the Phoenicians began to prosecute their commercial activities in Greek lands at the beginning of the eighth century, shortly after 800 B. C.

Now it is worth observing that Professor Carpenter has argued (41-62) that the Phoenicians had established no colonies in the Aegean and had no commercial relations with the Aegean until the *latter* part of the eighth century. In the belief that he had proved this thesis, he apparently assumed that he had also proved that there had been no *contact* between Greeks and Phoenicians before the latter part of the eighth century. These are entirely distinct propositions. For the purpose of determining the date of the adoption of the Phoenician alphabet by the Greeks the latter proposition holds more of importance for us<sup>26</sup>. Professor Carpenter writes as follows (60):

No written literature earlier than 650, no inscriptions and no writing earlier than 700, no contact between Greeks and Phoenicians earlier than 750 B. C.: such is the picture which I believe to be historically and archaeologically true. . . .

To the contrary, we have every assurance that it is archaeologically untrue that there was no *contact* between Greeks and Phoenicians earlier than 750 B. C. It is now very generally agreed that the Mycenaeans were Greeks. For some time it has been known that Palestine, Phoenicia, and inner Syria were under the influence of the Aegean world during the latter half of the second millennium B. C.<sup>27</sup> We are now able, thanks

<sup>16</sup>Anna Roes, *De Oorsprong der Geometrische Kunst* (Haarlem, Tjeenk Willink and Zoon, 1931, pp. 140-144). On pages 140-144 Dr. Roes has written, in French, a summary of the conclusions reached by her in this book. See reviews of the book, by Valentin Müller, *American Journal of Archaeology* 36 (1932), 201-202, and by Bernhard Schweitzer, *Gnomon* 10 (1934), 337-340. See, also, Anna Roes, *Greek Geometric Art, Its Symbolism and Its Origin* (Haarlem, H. D. Tjeenk Willink and Zoon, 1933, and Oxford University Press, London, Humphrey Milford, pp. 128), where the author defends the thesis which she had set forth in the book named above in this note, and elaborates it. See the reviews of the later book, by Valentin Müller, *American Journal of Archaeology* 37 (1933), 635-636, and by Bernhard Schweitzer, *Gnomon* 10 (1934), 349-353.

<sup>17</sup>Schweitzer, 148, 152 (see note 15, above); Humphry G. *elbert* <earth> Payne, *Protokorinthische Vasenmalerei*, 26 (Berlin, Keller, 1933).

<sup>18</sup>See the reviews of Dr. Roes's books that are named in note 16, above.

<sup>19</sup>Emil Kunze, *Zu den Anfängen der Griechischen Plastik*, *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung* 35 (1930), 141-162.

<sup>20</sup>Eduard Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*, Volume 2, Part 2, 113-122 (Stuttgart und Berlin, J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung Nachfolger, 1931).

<sup>21</sup>August Koster, *Das Antike Seewesen*, 46 (Berlin, Schoetz and Parrhysius, 1923), *Schiffahrt und Handelsverkehr des östlichen Mittelmeeres im 3. u. 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.*, 20-21 (Beihefte zum Alten Orient, Heft 1 [Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1924]).

<sup>22</sup>August Koster, *Schiffahrt und Handelsverkehr*, . . . 20-21 (see note 21, above). Compare J. D. S. Pendlebury, *Egypt and the*

*Aegean in the Late Bronze Age*, *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 16 (1930), 75-92, especially 89-92.

<sup>23</sup>Koster, *Schiffahrt und Handelsverkehr*, . . . 21-22 (see note 21, above).

<sup>24</sup>Martin P. Nilsson, *Homer and Mycenae*, 134 (see note 3, above).

<sup>25</sup>Eduard Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*, Volume 2, Part 2, 114-116 (see note 20, above).

<sup>26</sup>J. Penrose Harland, *Scripta Helladica and the Dates of Homer and the Hellenic Alphabet*, *American Journal of Archaeology* 38 (1934), 83-92, especially 91.

<sup>27</sup>See two articles by Peter Thomsen, (1) *Aegäischer Einfluss auf Palästina-Syrien, und Phönien*, in Max Ebert, *Reallexicon der Vorgeschichte*, 1.44-47, 10.135-139, especially 135 (Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 1924, 1927-1928).

to the very important excavations at Ras Shamra and its port, Minet el-Beida, to form a very adequate picture of the relations of the Mycenaeans with the Phoenicians during the Mycenaean Period (1600-1200)<sup>25</sup>. We can trace the trade route which the Mycenaeans followed along the southern coast of Asia Minor, through Rhodes and Cyprus, to the Syro-Phoenician coast. Very recent investigations have shown that Cyprus was a very important commercial center during the Mycenaean Period<sup>26</sup>. Ras Shamra, which is located on the Syro-Phoenician coast at the point which is closest to the outermost extremity of the eastern promontory of Cyprus, was the terminal, or one of the terminals, of this trade route. Products imported into Ras Shamra from Cyprus and the Aegean were transported in turn over the trade routes which extended from Ras Shamra to Mesopotamia and inner Syria, while the products of Mesopotamia were brought to Ras Shamra and transshipped to Egypt and the Aegean<sup>27</sup>. During the thirteenth and the twelfth centuries a colony of wealthy Cypriotes resided at Ras Shamra. A certain number of foreign colonists from other districts, Anatolians, Aegeans, and Syrians, also lived there at that time<sup>28</sup>. Obviously the Phoenicians of Ras Shamra were very active traders in the thirteenth century. Furthermore, Ras Shamra had been an active trading center as early as the third millennium B. C. The conditions existing in the thirteenth century were not the result of a mushroom growth<sup>29</sup>.

From another source we have evidence which shows that there was *contact* between Greeks and Phoenicians in early times. Professor Johannes Friedrich<sup>30</sup> has pointed out that the origin of the variation in the Greek transcription of the Semitic *tsade* in the names *Tūros* = *Sōr* and *Sidōn* = *Sīdōn* goes back to a remote period when the difference between *z* and *s* was still preserved in the Semitic language. The Greeks must, therefore, have taken over the names of Tyre and Sidon soon after the middle of the second millennium B. C. The archaeological evidence would place the date at about 1430 B. C., at the time when the Cretan-Mycenaean merchant fleet attained dominance in the eastern part of the Mediterranean and carried many Mycenaean objects to Syria and Phoenicia<sup>31</sup>.

Now that we have seen that there was *contact* between Greeks and Phoenicians during the Mycenaean Period (1600-1200), we must determine when relations between the two peoples ceased, to be resumed again at about 800 B. C. It must at once be recognized that commerce between the two peoples was not carried on by way of inland trade routes through Asia Minor. It is

true that there had been, since the third millennium, trade routes which connected the cities on the western coast of Asia Minor with the cities of Mesopotamia and Syria<sup>32</sup>, but the Greeks did not receive products from the East by way of these channels. It was not until the end of the Mycenaean Period, at about 1200, that the Greeks settled the coastal lands of Western Asia Minor<sup>33</sup>. Furthermore, for some time after 1200, trade was not carried on through the interior of Asia Minor. The destruction of the Hittite Empire at the end of the thirteenth century disrupted trade over the inland routes. In addition, the Phrygians invaded Asia Minor soon after 1200 and seem to have formed a very effective barrier between the Greeks and the highly civilized eastern races<sup>34</sup>. Trade through Asia Minor by land apparently was not resumed until some time not far removed from the beginning of the eighth century. But what of the old Mycenaean trade route by sea, along the southern coast of Asia Minor? The recent archaeological investigations of Dr. Einar Gjerstad<sup>35</sup> in Cyprus have shown that the Greek colonization of that island was completed by 1200 and that Cyprus no longer enjoyed trade relations either with the Greeks of the Aegean area or with eastern peoples. The fact that Cyprus had been the most important commercial center on this old trade route and that the Cypriotes did not, after 1200, enjoy the benefits of commerce which they formerly possessed would seem to show that trade by sea between the Aegean and the East had ceased by 1200. Furthermore, conditions in the twelfth century were not favorable for the prosecution of commerce between Greece and the East, for the wars and migrations which occurred during that century would have made trading ventures precarious. In addition, the power of the Mycenaean Greeks began to decline about 1200, and soon thereafter came the beginning of the period of the isolation of Greece which is usually characterized by the term Dark Ages. Therefore, with both land and sea routes closed, contact between Greeks and eastern peoples ceased, for a time, at about 1200.

In the interests of clearness I sum up Part II of this review. Professor Carpenter holds that there was *no contact* between Greeks and Phoenicians before 750 B. C. I have tried to show that *twice before 750 B. C. there was contact between Greeks and Phoenicians*, first between 1430 and 1200, and, secondly, after a period during which, for various reasons, that contact had ceased, shortly after 800 B. C.

(To be concluded)

BARNARD COLLEGE,  
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

JOHN DAY

#### PENNSYLVANIA WOLVES

To bring the interesting subject of wolf lore a little further up to date<sup>1</sup>, I give a few contributions from two widely used manuals, for sale in the local bookstores.

<sup>25</sup>Johannes Friedrich, *Ras Shamra. Ein Ueberblick über Funde und Forschungen*, in *Der Alte Orient*, 33 (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1933). Compare Albrecht Götz and Arthur Christensen, *Kulturgeschichte des Alten Orients*, 171 (Munich, Beck, 1933).

<sup>26</sup>Einar Gjerstad, *Studies on Prehistoric Cyprus*, 310-328 (Uppsala, Uppsala Universitets Arsskrift, 1926); *Illustrated London News* 183 (1933), 29-31.

<sup>27</sup>Rene Dussaud, *La Lydie et ses Voisins aux Hautes Époques*, 100-102 (Paris, Geuthner, 1930). Compare *Syria* 10 (1929), 298-303.

<sup>28</sup>Dussaud, 102-108 (see note 30, above).

<sup>29</sup>Illustrated London News 182 (1933), 178.

<sup>30</sup>Johannes Friedrich, *Zum Phönizisch-Punischen Zeitschrift für Statistik und Verwandte Gebiete* 2 (1923), 1-16, especially 4.

<sup>31</sup>W. F. Albright, *The Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society* 12 (1932), 186-187 (in an article entitled *The North-Canaanite Epic of Al'yan Ba'al and Môt*).

<sup>32</sup>Dussaud, 7-24 (see note 30, above).

<sup>33</sup>Götz and Christensen, 171 (see note 28, above). Compare Dietrich Pimmen, *Die Kretisch-Mykenische Kultur*, 15-16 (Leipzig, Teubner, 1924).

<sup>34</sup>Götz and Christensen, 194 (see note 28, above).

<sup>35</sup>Einar Gjerstad, 328-329 (see note 29, above).

<sup>1</sup>For material in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* relating to this subject see 22.83-86, 26.97-99, and especially 97, note 1, 24.103.

They are entitled (1) "Albertus Magnus: Being the Approved, Verified, Sympathetic and Natural Egyptian Secrets; or, White and Black Art for Man and Beast . . .", and (2) "John George Hohman's Pow-Wows, or Long Lost Friend".

Dread of the wolf has now largely disappeared. We now hear chiefly of the application of his peculiar powers to useful ends. Compare the following passage from *Long Lost Friend* (21)<sup>2</sup>: "Whoever carries the right eye of a wolf fastened inside his right sleeve, remains free from all injuries". Pliny the Elder (*Naturalis Historia* 28.228) is more sceptical about the efficacy of the eye of a wolf even in simple preventive medicine: *eas quidem <= febris> quae certo dierum numero redeunt <arct> oculus lupi dexter salsus adalligatusque, si credimus Magis. He has a little more faith in the teeth of wolves (28.257): *Dens lupi adalligatus infantium pavores prohibet dentiendique morbos, quod et pellis lupina praestat. Dentes quidem eorum maximi equis quoque adalligati infatigabilem cursum praestare dicuntur.**

Our modern wolves seem to be more highly endowed with miraculous powers than were the wolves of Pliny the Elder (or Horace), since the modern wolves remove *all* cause for fear, whereas the ancient wolves merely helped to calm or assuage certain fears of children. Compare Pliny 28.98 *Contra nocturnos pavores umbrarumque terrorum unus e magnis <hyænae> dentibus lino adligatus succurrere narratur. The remarkable effect of the teeth of wolves on horses is accepted as gospel truth in Albertus Magnus (101)<sup>3</sup>, without such a saving word as Pliny's *dicuntur*, and without any explanation such as Pliny's declaration that the horse's peculiar susceptibility to the powers of the wolf is due to the fact that the liver of the wolf has the form of a horse's hoof (28.263: compare 28.157).*

Elsewhere it appears that even the tooth of the wolf is associated with the power of his eye. Compare *Albertus Magnus* (87):

To Discern the Thief Who Robbed You.

Take the seed of sunflowers, which you must gather in the sign of the Lion in the month of August. Wrap the same up over a wolf's tooth; then take a bay leaf and wrap the tooth therein, then take the tooth, put it above your head, and you will see the thief.

The blood of the wolf has uses for the trained intelligence of a more advanced civilization <or, we may say, of a civilization that prides itself on being far more advanced. C. K.>. Compare *Albertus Magnus* (71):

If desirous to see Miraculus Things.

Take Argentum orum and wrap it up in a rag, and write, with wolf's blood, upon parchment:

†Ada†† Aba ebe†† thanat do† Zancha Agolat Zabohat†

Whoever carries these words on his person will be honored by every one. What he asks for he will receive. If held before a lock, the same will open unto him.

For this Pliny the Elder has no parallel, naturally, in view of the fact that the mark (represented above by a

<sup>2</sup>This work was first published near Reading, Pennsylvania, in 1820.

<sup>3</sup>For convenience the expressions *Long Lost Friend* and *Albertus Magnus* will be used in references to the two works named in the first paragraph of this paper.

dagger) so often repeated in the passage just quoted signifies "the highest name of God".

Compare, finally, *Albertus Magnus* (75):

A Wolf's Blessing.

The Lord Jesus Christ and St. Peter, one morning travelling together, while Mary proceedeth in a heather, she said: Ah, dear Lord, whence shall we hie. We will journey over hill and dale, protect therefore, dear Lord, my flock wherever it be, St. Peter takes his key and therefore closes every wolf's jaw, that they no bone nor lamb may gnaw.

†††Three Times.

FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE,  
LANCASTER, PENNSYLVANIA

S. L. MOHLER

A GOOD USE FOR POOR LATIN

The following extract from the book entitled "John George Hohman's Pow-Wows, or Long Lost Friend", 76-77<sup>1</sup>, may possess some interest for the sportsman or for the philologist.

The Talisman

An old hermit once found an old, lame huntsman in a forest lying beside the road and weeping. The hermit asked him the cause of his dejection. "Ah me, thou man of god, I am a poor, unfortunate being; I must annually furnish my lord with as many deer, and hares and partridges, as a young and healthy huntsman could hunt up, or else I will be discharged from my office; now I am old and lame; besides the game is getting scarce, and I cannot follow it up as I ought to; and I know not what will become of me" . . . The hermit, upon this, took out a small piece of paper upon which he wrote some words with a pencil, and . . . said: "There, old friend, put this in your game-bag whenever you go out hunting, and you shall certainly shoot something worth while. . . yet be careful to shoot no more than you necessarily need, nor to communicate it to anyone that might misuse it, on account of the high meaning contained in these words" . . . This huntsman was afterward and during his whole lifetime lucky in his hunting. . . The following is what the hermit wrote on the paper:

Ut nemo in sense tentat, descendre nemo,  
At precenti spectatur mantica tergo.  
The best argument is to try it.

The Latin is, of course, a corrupted version of *Persius* 4.23-24:

Ut nemo in sese temptat descendere, nemo,  
sed praecedenti spectatur mantica tergo!<sup>2</sup>

The nasalization of *sese* into *sense* and of *praecedenti* into *precedenti* and the spelling of *tentat* and *descendre* are worthy of note. The punctuation indicates clearly that the old hermit—or Hohman's more immediate informant—had no understanding of "the high meaning contained in these words". Users of this talisman keep the local markets well stocked with rabbits every fall.

FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE,  
LANCASTER, PENNSYLVANIA

S. L. MOHLER

<sup>1</sup>This work was first published near Reading, Pennsylvania, in 1820. <See the opening paragraph of the preceding article in this issue. C. K. >

<sup>2</sup>In The Satires of A. Persius Placcus, With a Translation and Commentary, by John Conington, Second Edition, Revised by Henry Nettleship (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1874), these verses are rendered as follows: "How utter, utter is the dearth of men who venture down into their own breasts, and how universally they stare at the wallet on the man's back before them". C. K. >

## FINIS REIPUBLICAE

Among the purely literary studies of the ancient world and the long series of novels and of plays on classical subjects the tetralogy entitled *Finis Reipublicae*, by Dr. Ante Tresic Pavicic, holds an important place, although it has not been known as widely as it should have been. Circumstances worked against the publication of these plays outside of their own country, and left them for many years in their original Yugoslav language, despite the fact that the author had himself prepared an Italian translation of them, the appearance of which was prevented by the World War.

Dr. Ante Tresic Pavicic has had a long and important career as statesman and as author. He was born on the Island of Lessina, in 1867. After an excellent education he served for a while in the Austrian Diet as a Representative from Dalmatia. Later, during the World War, he was one of the leaders who carried on within and without Croatia propaganda for Croatian independence. For a while he was in an Austrian prison. After the formation of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes (now Yugoslavia), he was for several years the Minister of his country in Washington. He now lives in the old city of Split (Spalato), where he continues his studies and his writing.

When the tetralogy *Finis Reipublicae* first appeared in 1908, it was very warmly greeted in France and in Italy. A writer in the *Figaro* of Paris, on May 13, 1908, said, 'I have found a remarkable knowledge of antiquity joined with very strong dramatic talent'. This praise was echoed by other critics. In his Introduction to the Italian translation of the first part, 'The Exile of Cicero', Umberto Urbani stresses the fact that the author had tried with success to combine with a picture of the actual course of events a certain interpretation of the last stages of the downfall of the Roman 'Republic' and a delineation of the leading characters of the day.

The tetralogy consists of four separate, full-length plays. It covers a period of some twenty years, from the episode of Clodius penetrating the house of Caesar to participate in the Mysteries of the Bona Dea, in 62 B. C., to the death of Brutus after the Battle of Philippi, in 42 B. C. The different plays are called respectively 'The Exile of Cicero', 'Cato of Utica', 'The Divine Julius', and 'Brutus and Porcia', or 'The Erynnies'.

The first play culminates in the exile of Cicero in 58 B. C. But the greater part of the action deals with the sacrifice of Clodius, the efforts of his sister (Clodia, the friend of Catullus) to swing Cicero to the defense of Clodius (an attempt which fails, but not without a considerable outbreak on the part of Cicero's wife, Terentia), and the actual trial of Clodius. It is here that the author gives some of his most striking passages, as he shows how for their own personal interests the various public men of Rome endeavor to save Clodius. Caesar's example may be cited. By speaking only of what he has definitely seen, he is quite unable to condemn Clodius, and his strong love of humanity refuses to allow him to have Clodius's slaves tortured to secure evidence against him. Over the testimony of Cicero lies the

shadow of the execution of the Catilinarian conspirators. At the end of the play Clodius has won his position as tribune, and Cicero is forced into exile.

The second play, 'Cato of Utica', opens with the challenge to Caesar that resulted in his passage of the Rubicon. In rapid succession thereafter come the Battle of Pharsalus, the death of Pompey, and the defeat of the Senatorial forces at Thapsus. This involves the death of Cato at Utica, for he refuses to survive the downfall of the Republic. On hearing of Cato's death, Caesar exclaims, 'I envy your death, as you have envied me the power of giving you life. You have destroyed the finest of my three hundred victories'.

In the third play, 'The Divine Julius', we have the climax of the tetralogy. The play opens with the return of Caesar to Rome in triumph after his African victories and his issuance of the Anticato. This angers Porcia, the daughter of Cato and the wife of Brutus, and the conspiracy against Caesar is launched. The general hostility of Brutus toward Caesar is not made any less when Caesar visits him and reveals that the idealist is really his own illegitimate son, and Servilia, the mother of Brutus, confirms the story. Caesar is shortly afterwards murdered. The scene in the Senate does not appear on the stage, for the murder is described in the house of Brutus, while the angry mob rages outside.

In the fourth and last play, 'Brutus and Porcia' (or, as it was later called, 'The Erynnies'), we have the remorse of Brutus and his despair after the murder, for he and his wife are both forced to recognize that times have changed and that neither the Senate nor the upper classes are what they were twenty years before. After the victory of Octavius and Antony at Philippi, Brutus and his wife commit suicide, with the feeling that their cause has been absolutely lost.

The figure of Caesar dominates the entire tetralogy, for he incarnates the greatness of Rome, as it swings away from the power of the Senate and the believers in the old system of administration. Caesar stands out as the exponent of the power of the 'Republic', even though he is not altogether guiltless, for he helps to give to the 'Republic' its final blow and he assists the forces which are striving to change and ruin it. Compared to him Cato of Utica is merely a proud descendant of the past, and Brutus but a weak dreamer, who knows not the past, the present, or the future, although he is continually striving to support the conservative side. Brutus refuses to be Caesar's heir, and murders him. Yet he cannot supply the energy and the devotion to an enlightened duty that Caesar shows constantly.

Dr. Tresic Pavicic studied closely Roman history before he wrote the tetralogy, and he sought to follow Roman history throughout. He has succeeded far better than many of the other authors who deal with classical subjects in a modern way. We can only regret that the tetralogy, which waited nearly twenty years for publication in Italian after the original translation had been made, has not yet found an English and American audience. It gives an excellent view of Roman life and thought in the last period of the 'Republic' and of the changes that the long period of civil wars produced on the mentality and the psychology of the Romans. The

entire tetralogy is a worthy memorial for a great poet. We can only hope that Dr. Tresic Pavicic will continue to work in this classical field in which he is truly a master.

DEPARTMENT OF SLAVONIC  
LANGUAGES,  
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

CLARENCE A. MANNING

**CLASSICAL ARTICLES IN NON-CLASSICAL  
PERIODICALS**

VI

The Saturday Review of Literature—September 1, Review, qualifiedly favorable, by Paul E. More, of Constantine Ritter, *The Essence of Plato's Philosophy* (Translated by Adam Alles); September 8, Review, generally favorable, by Elmer Davis, of Jack Lindsay, *Rome for Sale* [an historical novel]; September 29, Sketch for a New Lucretius, Irwin Edman ["What would be the character of a genuinely philosophical poet in our generation? What would be his theme, his materials, and his special difficulties? What would be the argument of his poem?"].

The Times Literary Supplement (London)—June 21, Review, very favorable, of P. S. Allen and H. M. Allen, *Opus Epistularum Des. Erasmi Roterodami Denuo Recognitum et Auctum*; Classical Archaeology *<in Italy>* Since 1918 [an extensive summary]; Classical Scholarship *<in Italy>* [a summary and appraisal of recent research and publication. "Classical scholarship in Italy is passing beyond the stage at which mere philology and mere archaeology and mere political history can be regarded each as an end in itself. History seeks help from every quarter"]; Review, favorable, of Werner Jaeger, *Aristotle: Fundamentals of the History of His Development* (Translated by R. Robinson); June 28, Attributed to Milton, L. B. Hessler [this letter to the editor contains the text of a long Latin epitaph entitled "Julii Mazirini, Cardinalis, Epitaphium, Authore Joh. Milton"]; Brief review, favorable, of J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*; July 12, Review, favorable, of Arnaldo Momigliano, *Claudius: The Emperor and His Achievement* (Translated by W. D. Hogarth); July 19, Review, favorable, of Sir George Macdonald, *The Roman Wall in Scotland*<sup>2</sup>; Dryden and Thomas May, Allan G. Chester [the

writer of this letter quotes parallel passages to show that "in translating the 'Georgics' <of Vergil> Dryden adapted many lines from the verse translation of Thomas May, published in 1628.... I have noted more than one hundred lines of Dryden's translation (particularly in the second 'Georgic') which have been obviously borrowed from May"]; Brief review, qualifiedly favorable, of H. J. Rose, *A Handbook of Greek Literature* from Homer to the Age of Lucian; Brief review, qualifiedly favorable, of Arthur Weigall, *A Short History of Ancient Egypt*; July 26, Review, mildly favorable, of Robert J. Bonner, *Aspects of Athenian Democracy*; Brief review, favorable, of Giacomo Prampolini, *Storia Universale della Letteratura*, Volume II; Brief review, generally favorable, of E. E. Spicer, *Aristotle's Conception of the Soul*; Brief review, favorable, of Joshua C. Gregory, *Combustion from Heraclitus to Lavoisier*; August 2, French Epigrams ["The writer who, more than any other, has influenced epigram in the last three hundred years is undoubtedly Martial.... France, even more than England, has magnified Martial at the expense of the Greek Anthology.... their preference of the sharp to the sweet, the bright to the tender, has continued to this day"]; Brief review, generally favorable, of Raymond P. Dougherty, *Archives from Erech, Neo-Babylonian and Persian Periods*; August 9, Epigrams, Stephen Gaselee [a letter to the editor, taking exception to the statement in the issue of August 2 that Martial "is often surprisingly slow in coming to the point"]; Brief review, favorable, of Léon Legrain, *Luristan Bronzes in the University <of Pennsylvania> Museum*; Brief review, uncritical, of Pan Aristophron, *Plato's Academy: The Birth of the Idea of Its Rediscovery*; Brief review, very favorable, of G. Howard, *Clavis Cuneorum Sive Lexicon Signorum Assyriorum, Linguis Latina, Britannica, Germanica*; August 16, Review, favorable, of R. W. Seton-Watson, *A History of the Roumanians from Roman Times to the Completion of Unity*; August 23, Review, favorable, of Jack Lindsay, *Medieval Latin Poets*; August 30, Review, generally favorable, of Compton Mackenzie, *Marathon and Salamis*.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY,  
MIDDLEBURY, CONNECTICUT

JOHN W. SPAETH, JR.